Deictic Pronouns in Anatolian[*]

H. Craig Melchert

University of California at Los Angeles

I. Synchronic Data

Recent research, most notably that of Goedegebuure (2002/3 and 2006) on Hittite, has brought significant changes in the synchronic picture of deictic pronouns in the Indo-European languages of Anatolia. Before offering a tentative account of their prehistoric development, I must therefore first make clear what I take to be the attested facts in the various languages.

As demonstrated by Goedegebuure (2002/3), Hittite shows not a two-way contrast in deixis, as traditionally assumed, but rather a three-way contrast based on person, similar to that of Latin: *kā-* 'this' (near, first-person, *hic*); *apā-* 'that' (second person, *iste*); *aši+* 'that' (far, third-person, *ille*). Also important is the "disassociative" or deprecative use of far-deictic *aši* (Goedegebuure 2002/3, Hoffner 2002/3), which affirms the analysis of Hittite *ašiwant-* 'poor man' as 'one of *that* kind' (thus with Laroche 1950: 42-43 against all others!).

In addition to the productive three-way system just described, Hittite also shows a rare stem *ana-* with near-deictic force, only assured in temporal use in *ani-šiwat/ani*-UD.KAM-*ti* 'today', but now also attested in the hapax dative-locative *anedani* (see Neu 1997: 156, but *ani* is not the bare stem, but with Rieken 1999: 104 the original dative-locative singular).[1]

There is also a stem *anna/i-* with geminate *-nn-* that has a far-deictic sense. It is attested mostly in temporal use in the adverbs *annaz/annišan* 'formerly'. It is important to note that these are not attested before Neo-Hittite, in texts of Mursili II. One may contrast in the Deeds of Suppiluliuma, fragment 28 (KBo 14.12+ iv 27&35) the use of *annaz* in Mursili's narrative vs. *karuwiliyaz* in the quotation of his father Suppiluliuma. On the other hand the adjective *annalla/i-* 'former, of old' occurs already in the Middle Hittite letter HKM 5,8.

There are only two examples of the base stem *anna/i-*:
maḫḫan=šamaš kāš tuppianza anda wemiezzi nu annin 1 *LIM* 7 *ME* 1 ERÍN.MEŠ ᵁᴿᵁ*Išḫupitta liliwaḫḫuanzi ninikten* (HKM 20,4-9)
'When this tablet reaches you, mobilize in a hurry those 1701 troops of I.'
GÚ.R[I.TA] [*IŠ-TU AN-NI-I*]*Š an-ni-iš* 'that one, the afore-mentioned one' (KBo 1.42 iii 33)

---

[1] Contra Kloekhorst (2008: 767) there is no justification for doubting the reality of *ana-*, and its near-deictic sense precludes connecting it with far-deictic *aši-*.

The new example from the Middle Hittite letter now assures the reality of the lexical entry, whose authenticity had previously often been doubted. The mixed *a*- and *i*-inflection and the appearance of the stem only in Middle Hittite suggest a loanword (thus also Kloekhorst 2008: 173-174 following Kammenhuber). Note that in the occurrence in the letter the troops referred to are in the sphere of the addressee, so *anna/i*- in Hittite clearly covers the scope of both *iste* and *ille*.

Finally, I call attention to the fact that no deictic stem *šia*- or *ši*- exists in Hittite. Goedegebuure (2006) has shown that the stem *šia*- is instead the number 'one' (see Pinault 2006 for equation with some forms of Tocharian AB *ṣa-/ṣe*- 'one').

Palaic appears to show a two-way deictic contrast of near-deictic *kā*- 'this' (*hic*) versus far-deictic *ānni*- 'that' (*iste/ille*). For evidence that the latter includes second-person (*iste*) see:

ānnī wašū=ḫa [*tab*]arna ti=kuar [--] šūna (KUB 35.165 Vo 23-24)

'Also those good things, Tabarna, pour out yourself!'

All clear examples of *apā*- in Palaic are anaphoric: *kuiš=a…=apan* in KUB 35.165 Ro 15.&20 and *annaš pāpaš…n=āpiš* in 35.163 iii 21-211 (for the texts see Carruba 1970).

Evidence for the deictic system of Cuneiform Luvian is sparse. It is clear that *zā*- is 'this' (near, first-person, *hic*). Of the few examples of *apā*-, most are anaphoric, but note perhaps *apatti ārrī* 'at that time' in KBo 9.141 i 14. If this

example is correctly interpreted, it suggests that *apā-* is synchronically 'that' (far, probably both *iste/ille*), but see further below. In any case, the words *āššiwant(i)-* 'poor' and *āššiwantattar* 'poverty', clearly cognate with Hittite *ašiwant-* 'poor' (Starke 1990: 448-9), show that at some point Cuneiform Luvian also had far-deictic **āšši-*. A further complication is that the particle *-sa/-za* added to nouns and adjectives in the nominative-accusative singular neuter originally had near-deictic force, apparently continuing a prehistoric stem **so-* 'this'. In KBo 29.6 Ro 25 *īnzagan=za* 'this inhumation' is transparently parallel to *zaš zammitātiš* 'this flour' (Ro 22), *zā wašḫašaura* 'these w.' (Ro 27) and *zaš kummaš* ^{ᵛNA₄}*āššu*[*š*] 'this holy pillar' (Ro 30).[2] In most instances no deictic value for *-sa/-za* is discernible.

The synchronic situation is rather clearer for Hieroglyphic Luvian: *zā-* means 'this' (near, first-person, *hic*), while *apā-* 'that' marks far deixis (both *iste* and *ille*). Examples for far, third-person deixis:

> REL-*pa-wa/i* | *á-TANA-wa/i-ní-zi*(URBS) | *zi-tà* | *á-pa-ti-i* INFRA-*ta* | (SOLIUM)*i-sà-nú-wa/i-ha* (KARATEPE §XXXI in Hu; Ho has *a-pa-ri+i*) 'I indeed settled down there Adanians from here.' (in conquered western lands)

---

[2] See Arbeitman (1992: 34) after Melchert. Since Luvian loses word-final stops, we cannot be sure whether the attested form represents **-so* or **-sod*.

NEG$_2$-*a-wa/i* | *tara/i-pa^i-mi-i-sa* | *za-na* | *a-pa-ha* ("PES$_2$")*a+ra/i-ta-'* | *ka+ra/i-mi-sà*(URBS) (ASSUR a §6)

'Did not T. reach Carchemish by this way or that?' (with elliptic "accusative of path" or alternatively with Hawkins 2000: 542-3 'now and then')

An example showing second-person deixis is:

| ("CANIS")*zú-wa/i-ni-zi-ha-wa/i* | *a-pa-zi* |REL-*ri+i-'* | *a-sa-ti* | *a-wa/i* | 2-*zi-i* | *sa-na-wa/i-i-zi* ("*481")*wa/i+ra/i-mu-ta-li-zi* | PUGNUS-*ri+i-'* *wa/i-mu* | VIA-*wa/i-ni* (ASSUR b §8-10)

'If there are (any of) those dogs, pick two good ones *with a strong sense of smell* and send them to me.'

It is clear that in the last example the dogs in question are within reach of the addressee, while in the first two *apā*- is referring to something remote, versus the near indicated by forms of *zā*-. In Hieroglyphic Luvian the -*sa*/-*za* added to forms in the neuter nominative-accusative singular has become a virtually obligatory particle with no apparent functional value.

Unfortunately, no new evidence for deixis in Lycian has appeared, and we know only that, rather unexpectedly, the stem *ebe*- marks near deixis (often translating Greek τουτο-). The marker for far deixis remains unknown.

In addition to the well-established stem *eš-* 'this' (near-deictic, *hic*), Lydian thus far attests a single instance of a contrasting stem *oš-* 'that' (*iste/illĕ*?):[3]

es *šadmẽs oš=k anlola* [ ] (Text 70 Gusmani 1986: 153)

'This injunction/inscription and the *a.* before you (*iste*) [belong to]'

As per Gusmani (1982: 81 with reference), it is clear that *oš-* marks a deixis contrasting with that of *eš-*, despite the fact that *anlola* also refers to part of the tomb complex and is regularly modified by *eš-*. For my translation see the immediately following discussion of Carian. Contra Melchert (1991: 137ff.) the existence of deictic stems *ẽna-* and *ãna-* in Lydian is very dubious: see the cogent criticisms of Schürr (1997: 202[3]) and Gérard (2005: 82[501]).

Notwithstanding dramatic recent progress in the decipherment of the alphabet, our understanding of Carian grammar remains limited, and any discussion of deixis must be regarded as provisional. Nevertheless, it seems reasonably clear that there is a stem *sa-/sn-* 'this' (near, first-person, *hic*): *upe sa* 'this stele' (E.Me 26); *śías san* = σῆμα τόδε 'this memorial' (G. 1); *snn orkn* 'this bowl' (object of *ûbt* 'dedicated'(C.xx 1).[4]

---

[3] I now follow Schürr (1999: 171-173) in transliterating the Lydian *dental* sibilant as *s* and the *palatal(ized)* sibilant as *š* (vs. previous *ś* and *s* respectively).

[4] I now cite all Carian texts after the new superior and marvelously rational system of Adiego (2007), but I cannot follow him in his idiosyncratic transliteration of letters representing forms of the high back rounded vowel. I therefore retain *ú* for letter 32, while replacing the misleading *w*

Other Carian deicitic stems are less clear. There probably is a near-deicitic *an-* 'this' in *an sidi* 'this tomb' (C.Tr 2) and in *ann* 'this' (C.Ka 3).[5] I also suggest that there is a stem *u-* with the force of *iste*, attested in *upa ú* 'the stele before you' (E.Me 13) and in *ue* 'the one before you' (E.Me 3,28,42, etc.). Given the other evidence for the deictic adjective following the noun, I see no reason to take the *ú* of the first text as an error (thus hesitantly Adiego 2007: 272). The equation of *ue* with *upe*, the word for 'stele' or 'tomb' via a "sporadic" loss of intervocalic *p* is entirely ad hoc and unconvincing (compare Adiego 2007: 430 with reference to Schürr). For the use of a stem marking second-person deixis referring to a tomb one may compare the usage of *iste* in Latin, for which the *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae* 7.508 cites several examples: *locum istum, ubi requiesco* 'this place, where I am resting'; *felicitas isto clauditur tumulo* 'happiness is enclosed by this grave'; and especially *hic Priami non est tumulus nec condor in ista sede* 'This is not the grave of Priam; I am not placed in this seat', where both *hic* and *iste* are used of the same tomb installation. Tomb inscriptions could thus for deictic

---

for letter 28 with *û* (vs. Adiego's highly misleading *w* and *ý* respectively). For *sa-/sn-* as 'this' see Adiego (2007: 319-320).

[5] See on these Adiego (2007: 352). I tentatively take both forms as neuter nom.-acc. singular, the former reflecting the older ending **-od*, which would have been lost entirely, and the latter secondary use of **-om*, which with syncope of the vowel could have produced *ann* (see Melchert, forthcoming).

reference take the perspective of either the occupant or the viewer, or even both in the same text.[6]

Finally, in considering the history of the stem *apā-*, one should bear in mind that its use as an *anaphoric* pronoun is pan-Anatolian, being assured for Hittite, Palaic, both forms of Luvian, Lycian and Lydian—only in Carian is this use not established. This function then can safely be attributed to Proto-Anatolian.

II. Diachronic Analysis

The very limited attestation of some deictic stems in languages outside Hittite precludes a definitive reconstruction of the Proto-Anatolian system. Nevertheless, some features seem reasonably clear. The near-deictic stem was *$\hat{k}o/i$-* 'this', which was maintained in Hittite, Palaic, Luvian and probably Carian. It was lost and replaced in Lycian and Lydian.

I also contend that the only possible function of the stems *é/ó-* and *é/óno/i-* in Proto-Anatolian is *anaphoric*. I see no other way to explain the direct conflict of far-deictic *ési* in Hittite and Luvian vs. near-deictic *eš-* in Lydian, and of near-deictic *ana-* in Hittite vs. far-deictic *ānni-* in Palaic (and *late* Hittite *anna/i-*). I am

---

[6] A deictic stem *os-* in Sidetic matching Lydian *oš-*, as suggested by Eichner (1988), is unlikely. The word *osad* in texts III and IV more likely means 'by year, yearly' (cognate with Luvian *ušša/i-* 'year') than 'there'.

unaware of any convincing examples where a pronominal stem that had fixed near- or far-deixis has acquired the diametrically opposing value.[7]

On the other hand, an anaphoric stem may easily acquire secondarily a defined deictic value based on usage in opposition to an already established deictic stem. Compare German 'Die Liebe dauert, oder dauert nicht, in dem oder jenem Ort' 'Love lasts or doesn't last, in this or that place' (Brecht, *Dreigroschenoper*), where *dem* functions as 'this' in opposition to *jenem* 'that'.[8]

---

[7] Brent Vine (pers. comm.) calls my attention to Greek (ἐ)κεῖ 'there' and (ἐ)κεῖνος 'that', which appear to contain PIE near-deictic *$\hat{k}e/i$-*. However, both Chantraine (1968: 329) and Frisk (1973: 475-476) argue that the far-deictic value of (ἐ)κεῖ 'there' (which likely does reflect a locatival form of *$\hat{k}e/i$-*) is secondary, due to the influence of (ἐ)κεῖνος. For the *-ke-* of the latter they compare not only reflexes of *$\hat{k}e/i$-* but also the *-c(e)* of Latin *hi-c*. Contrary to a widespread claim, this *–c(e)* is a reinforcing particle that has nothing whatsoever to do with the near-deictic pronominal stem *$\hat{k}e/i$-* (see correctly Ernout-Meillet 1959: 109, 293 and 433). Greek κεῖνος may continue a combination *ke-enos* with the opposite order from Latin *hi-c*: cf. Latin *nun-c* and Hittite *ki-nun* 'now' likewise with opposite order of the same reinforcing particle. The far-deictic value of (ἐ)κεῖνος < *eno-* is secondary like that of Hittite *anna/i-*.

[8] Jay Jasanoff (pers. comm.) reminds me that forms of *der* have had deictic function throughout the history of German. I do not find it remotely credible, however, that Brecht's usage directly reflects anything old. In any case, invoking older stages of the language merely transposes the problem. The most common use of *ther/der* in Old High German is anaphoric, in which function it translates Latin *hic*, *ille*, and *iste*. Its deictic value was variable, as shown by examples from Tatian such as *fon theru stuntu* 'from this hour' (139,5 = John 12,27 *ex hac hora*) vs. *in thēn tagun* 'in

With the loss of the competing original deictic pronoun, use of the anaphoric stem
for a fixed deixis may be grammaticalized. It cannot be coincidence that *esi*
acquires far-deictic function in Hittite and CLuvian where *$\hat{k}o/i$-* 'this' remains,
but near-deictic value in Lydian, where *$\hat{k}o/i$-* 'this' is lost.[9]

The general objection to such splits by Kloekhorst (2008: 174) is totally
unfounded. One must with him, however, reject the split of the same stem into
opposing functions in the *same* language. Thus the scenario of Melchert (1994b:
303) for Hittite *ana-* 'this' vs. *anna-* 'that' based on ablaut variation is not
remotely credible (for withdrawal of the alleged Lydian parallel see above). The
late attestation and stem variation *anna/i-* are prima facie evidence for a
Luvianism in Hittite. As per Yakubovich (forthcoming), Hieroglyphic Luvian is

---

those days' (5,11 = Luke 2,1 *in diebus illis*). Other authors employ *ther/der* to mark far-deixis in
contrast to *these/dese* 'this'. See Eggers (1960: 58) on Isidor, Sehrt (1962: 29) on Notker, and
Kelle (1881: 601) on Otfried. One may note that the latter use is the opposite of that in the Brecht
example.

[9] Those who object to derivation of a deictic usage from an anaphoric one may alternatively
suppose that in PIE and into the (pre)history of the descendant languages there coexisted for the
stems cited both use as anaphoric pronouns and as *generalized* demonstratives with no fixed
deixis, the latter being determined by the linguistic or extra-linguistic context (compare the use of
colloquial English 'yay' in expressions like 'yay long', which has no meaning without the
obligatory accompanying gesture). I insist only that the stems *$\acute{e}/\acute{o}$-* and *$\acute{e}/\acute{o}no/i$-* entered PA with
no fixed deixis.

the usual source of Luvianisms in Hittite. There is no direct evidence for far-deictic *anna/i-* there, but I point out that all the evidence is from first millennium texts. We simply do not know what the deictic system of Hieroglyphic Luvian was in the second millennium when *anna/i-* apparently entered Hittite.

The status of the stem *ob(h)ó/í-* in Proto-Anatolian is more complicated. Since its use there as an anaphoric stem is assured, it is possible that it too had only this value, and that it underwent a subsequent split like *é/ó-* and *é/óno/i-*. Once again note that it shows near deixis only in Lycian, where *k̂o/i-* 'this' is lost, but second-person deixis in Hittite and far deixis in Luvian, where *k̂o/i-* is retained. However, the evidence cited above for the use of Latin *iste* in tomb inscriptions as effectively equivalent to *hic* suggests another possibility: that Proto-Anatolian already had the three-way system of Hittite, with *ob(h)ó/í-* marking second-person deixis. This function was maintained in Hittite (and in Luvian, with eventual broadening to include far, third-person deixis), while in Lycian frequent usage similar to that of Latin led to its ousting of *k̂o/i-* 'this', perhaps under pressure of encroachment from the as yet unattested Lycian far-deictic stem.

We are still left with the question of what the *far*-deictic stem was in Proto-Anatolian. For reasons given above it cannot have been *é/ó-* or *é/óno/i-*. One *could* entertain the possibility that Proto-Anatolian had a two-way contrast in which *ob(h)ó/í-* covered the functions of both *iste* and *ille*. But it is not then clear

to me how or why the stem *é/ó- would have acquired far deictic value in Hittite

or *é/óno/i- far-deictic value in Palaic (and probably HLuvian). Despite the lack

of direct evidence for far (third-person) force, Lydian oš- (and perhaps Carian u-)

suggests that the PA far-deictic stem was *e/owo- (= Av. auua-, OCS ovŭ 'that'

etc.).

The system one assumes for Proto-Anatolian depends crucially on whether

one supposes that it had a two-way or three-way contrast. One possibility is a

binary system:

Anaphoric	Near-Deictic (*hic*)	Far-Deictic (*iste & ille*)
*ob(h)ó/í-, *é-/o-, *é/óno-	*k̂o/i-	*e/ow(o)-

Given this starting point, one must then assume the following changes into the

attested languages. In Lydian *k̂o/i- 'this' was lost, replaced by *ési, while

*e/ow(o)- 'that' was retained (appearing as secondarily inflected *ósi). In Lycian

*k̂o/i- 'this' was likewise lost, replaced in this case by *ob(h)ó/í-. Expression of

far deixis remains unknown. Carian may have retained *k̂o/i- 'this' (but

acquiring a competing *óno- 'this') and likewise *e/ow(o)- 'that'. However, I

must stress that the standard assumption that Carian sa-/sn- reflects *k̂o/i- (e.g.

Adiego 2007: 410) is merely probable and by no means assured. We cannot

entirely exclude that the Carian stem sa-/sn- matches rather the *so- of the

postposed Luvian particle -sa/-za, whose functional status in Proto-Anatolian is

quite unclear. Palaic retained *$\hat{k}o/i$- 'this' and replaced *$e/ow(o)$- 'that' with
*$\acute{e}no/i$-.

The development to Hittite and Luvian is more complicated, if one assumes
only a two-way contrast for Proto-Anatolian. Both would have retained *$\hat{k}o/i$-
'this' (with marginal competition from *$\acute{o}no$- in the case of Hittite). Luvian and
Hittite would have together innovated a three-way contrast, making *$ob(h)\acute{o}/i$ the
marker of second-person deixis (*iste*). Hittite and Cuneiform Luvian both replaced
*e/owo- as the marker of far deixis with *$\acute{e}si$ (retained in CLuvian *$\bar{a}\check{s}\check{s}i$-,
modified to *$\acute{o}si$ in Hittite under the influence of *$\hat{k}o$- and *$ob(h)\acute{o}$-).
Hieroglyphic Luvian *apparently* used rather *$\acute{e}no/i$-, based on the plausible, but
not yet provable, assumption that late Hittite far-deictic *anna/i*- is a loanword
from Luvian. By the time of the attested texts, Luvian *apā*- appears to have ousted
respectively *$\bar{a}\check{s}\check{s}i$- and *anna/i*- and restored a two-way contrast.

I stress that the scenario just described is not the only possibility. Since
several Anatolian languages show competing stems for either near or far deixis, it
is conceivable that Luvian never had more than a basic two-way contrast, with
*$\bar{a}\check{s}\check{s}i$- and *anna/i*- merely competitors with *apā*- for far deixis. More data for
CLuvian and for HLuvian in the second millennium would be needed to resolve
this issue.

As indicated above, current available data also permits positing a three-way
contrast already for Proto-Anatolian:

Anaphoric	1st Person (*hic*)	2nd Person (*iste*)	3rd Person (*ille*)
*ob(h)ó/í-,	** k̂o/i-*	**ob(h)ó/í-*	**e/ow(o)-*
*é-/o-, *é/óno-			

Under this assumption Lydian would have reduced the three-way to a two-way contrast by losing both first-person ** k̂o/i-* and second-person **ob(h)ó/í-*, replacing the former with **ési* and extending the use of **e/ow(o)-* to cover both second- and third-person contexts. Lycian would have extended the use of second-person **ob(h)ó/í-* to first-person contexts. Whether it retained its function of marking second-person deixis or was replaced by some other stem marking far deixis is at present impossible to determine. Carian would have eliminated second-person **ob(h)ó/í-* and extended far-deictic **e/owo-* to cover both second- and third-person contexts. Palaic eliminated both second-person **ob(h)ó/í-* and third-person **e/owo-*, replacing them with a single far-deictic **éno/í-*. Hittite and Pre-Luvian would have retained the three-way contrast, replacing third-person **e/owo-* with either **ési* (Hittite and CLuvian) or **éno/í-* (apparently HLuvian). In attested Luvian **ob(h)ó/í-* has extended its sphere to include all non-first-person deixis.

I conclude with some consideration of formal issues. PA ** k̂o/i-* 'this' regularly leads to Hittite, Palaic *kā/i-*, Luvian *zā/i-* and may also be the source of Carian *s(n)-* (but see above on the Carian). Carian *u-* and Lydian *o(š)-* may continue PA **e/owo-* with syncope and contraction of the resulting diphthong. The Lydian stem *oš-* shows secondary inflection of an animate nominative

singular *oš, modeled on eš- < *ési (cf. for such secondary inflection occasional

Hittite forms such as anim. nom. sg. ašiš or anim. acc. sg. unin to aši, uni).

Neither the Carian nor Lydian can show whether the PIE far-deictic stem *e/owo-

had e- or o-vocalism. As per Melchert (1994b), Hittite ana- with single -n- reflects

PA *óno-, while Palaic ānni- and the putative HLuvian anna/i- seen in late Hittite

continue PA *éno/i-.

PA animate nominative singular *ési leads directly to Lydian eš- and

CLuvian *āšši- (the latter by "Čop's Law"). At least in Lydian secondary

inflection of *ési led to a new synchronic stem eš- (for this development see

above on Hittite). Evidence for an alleged umlaut of *a < *e by following i in

Lydian (Melchert 1994a: 345) is gratuitous (both eš- < *ési and šerli- < *serli-

may be survivals).[10] As per Kloekhorst (2008: 220-221), the o-vocalism of Hittite

aši/uni is analogical to *k̂o- and *ob(h)ó-. For e-vocalism in accented anaphoric

stem *é- see also Dunkel, forthcoming.[11] However, the source of the -i in PA *ési

(presumably animate nominative singular) is quite unclear, and the special

treatment of *óm# as *un# in Hittite in absolute final position (see now

Kloekhorst 2008: 99) makes it chronologically difficult to assume that the -i ran

---

[10] Note, however, that taking Lydian eš as a direct continuant of *esi does require that the "limited

Čop's Law" assumed in Melchert 1994b and used to account for Palaic ānni- and the stem anna/i-

be post-PA, since Lydian would be excluded (otherwise *ési > *assi).

[11] However, o-vocalism in the unstressed anaphoric pronoun is already PA: *́-os, ́-om.

through the PA paradigm. The PA inflection of *é/ó- (and *í-?) is an open

question (compare on this point Kloekhorst 2008: 220-221).

The origin of the PA anaphoric and deictic stem *ob(h)ó/í- remains a crux.

Functionally, an attractive derivation of the fundamentally anaphoric but emphatic

*ob(h)ó/í- would be from *ó- + -bho (asseverative particle seen in Lithuanian bà

etc.). But accent on the final syllable is hard to explain by this account.[12] Also

disturbing would be the lack of evidence for original internal inflection of *ó- in

*ós/m+bho etc. (contrast Hittite aši, uni). Jay Jasanoff (pers. comm.) suggests that

the stem *obhó/í- reflects a secondarily inflected form of an adverb *o-bhí seen in

Sanskrit abhí '(up) to, against', OCS ob(ъ) 'around, at' etc. In favor of this

derivation one may cite the Hittite adverb apiya 'there (by you)', which in formal

terms appears to be the allative of a stem *abi-, but which cannot be motivated as

an innovation (compare already Pedersen 1938: 50-51). Compare rather kā 'here,

hither', which shows the expected a-stem form. In a language where so-called "i-

mutation" is relatively restricted,[13] the absolutely fixed i-stem inflection of Lydian

anaphoric bi- is also noteworthy and supports the existence of a real PA stem

---

[12] There is no evidence for an alleged aphaeresis in HLuvian (see Hawkins 2003: 159-161 for the

odd orthography of "initial a- final"), but vowel lengthening in Hittite and CLuvian and genuine

aphaeresis in Lydian anaphoric bi- confirm the accentuation *ob(h)ó/í-.

[13] On Anatolian "i-mutation", whereby stems are inflected with an inserted -i- just in certain

animate case forms, see now most recently Rieken (2005).

*obhí-. The more dominant stem *obhó- may be analogical to *ĝ̂ko-. Since as noted above the stem *é/ó- had no fixed deixis in PIE, this derivation does not resolve the issue of whether *obhó/í- already marked second-person deixis in PA, but it would account for the source of the stem.

The foregoing discussion has necessarily had to leave some conclusions provisional and to allow for alternative scenarios, while leaving some issues entirely unresolved. I have tried at least to reassess the system of deixis in Anatolian in the light of recent new evidence regarding the synchronic facts in the attested languages. I believe these make it clear that the Proto-Anatolian system cannot have been that of any of the individual languages, all of which have undergone some degree of renewal. We may hope that new evidence will allow us to further refine the picture sketched here.

<div align="center">References</div>

Adiego, Ignacio J. 2007. *The Carian Language*. Leiden/Boston: Brill.

Arbeitman, Yoël. 1992. "Luwian *za-* and *-sa* (/-za/): How I have changed my mind." *Balkansko Ezikoznanie* 35:3-58.

Carruba, Onofrio. 1970. *Das Palaische. Texte, Grammatik, Lexikon* (*StBoT* 10). Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Chantraine, Pierre. 1968. *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque: histoire des mots*. Paris: Klincksieck.

Dunkel, George. Forthcoming. *Lexikon der indogermanischen Partikeln und Pronominalstämme*.

Eggers, Hans. 1960. *Vollständiges Lateinisch-Althochdeutsches Wörterbuch zur althochdeutschen Isidor-Übersetzung*. Berlin: Akademie Verlag.

Eichner, Heiner. 1988. "*os-*, eine sidetisch-lydische Wortgleichung?" *Kadmos* 27:44-56.

Ernout, Alfred, and Antoine Meillet. 1959. *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue latine: histoire des mots*. Paris: Klincksieck.

Frisk, Hjalmar. 1973. *Griechisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch*. Heidelberg: Winter.

Gérard, Raphaël. 2005. *Phonétique et morphologie de la langue lydienne*. Louvain: Peeters.

Goedegebuure, Petra. 2002/03. "The Hittite 3rd person/distal demonstrative *aši* (*uni, eni*, etc.)." *Sprache* 43/1:1-32.

Goedegebuure, Petra. 2006. "A new proposal for the reading of the Hittite numeral '1': *šia-*." In Theo van den Hout (ed.), *The life and times of Hattušili III and Tutḫaliya IV. Proceedings of a symposium held in honour of J. de Roos*, 165-188. Leiden: Nederlands Instituut voor het Nabije Oosten.

Gusmani, Roberto. 1982. *Lydisches Wörterbuch. Ergänzungsheft 2*. Heidelberg: Winter.

Gusmani, Roberto. 1986. *Lydisches Wörterbuch. Ergänzungsheft 3*. Heidelberg: Winter.

Hawkins, J. David. 2000. *Corpus of Hieroglyphic Luwian Inscriptions. Volume I. Inscriptions of the Iron Age*. Berlin/New York: de Gruyter.

Hawkins, J. David. 2003. "Chapter Four. Scripts and Texts." In H. Craig Melchert (ed.), *The Luwians*, 128-169. Boston/Leiden: Brill.

Hoffner, Harry. A. Jr. 2002/03. "Hittite *a-aš-ma*." *Sprache* 43/1:80-87.

Kelle, Johann. 1881. *Glossar der Sprache Otfrids*. Regensburg: Manz.

Kloekhorst, Alwin. 2008. *Etymological Dictionary of the Hittite Inherited Lexicon*. Leiden/Boston: Brill.

Laroche, Emmanuel. 1950. "Études de vocabulaire." *RHA* 11:38-45.

Melchert, H. Craig. 1991. "The Lydian Emphasizing and Reflexive Particle *-ś/-is*. *Kadmos* 30:131-142.

Melchert, H. Craig. 1994a. *Anatolian Historical Phonology*. Leiden/Atlanta: Rodopi.

Melchert, H. Craig. 1994b. " 'Čop's Law' in Common Anatolian." In Jens Rasmussen (ed.), *In honorem Holger Pedersen*, 297-306. Wiesbaden: Reichert.

Melchert, H. Craig. Forthcoming. "Further Thoughts on Carian Nominal Inflection." In Piet van Bremen & Mathieu Carbon (eds.), *Proceedings of the International Conference HKC Hellenistic Karia*. Bordeaux: Ausonius.

Neu, Erich. 1997. "Zu einigen Pronominalformen des hethitischen." In Dorothy

Disterheft (ed.), *Studies in honor of Jaan Puhvel*, 139-169. Washington DC:

Institute for the Study of Man.

Pedersen, Holger. 1938. *Hittitisch und die anderen indo-europäischen Sprachen*.

Copenhagen: Munksgaard.

Pinault, Georges-Jean. 2006. "Retour sur le numéral "un" en tokharien." *IF*

111:71-97.

Rieken, Elisabeth. 1999. *Untersuchungen zur nominalen Stammbildung des*

hethitischen (*StBoT* 44). Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Rieken, Elisabeth. 2005. "Neues zum Ursprung der anatolischen *i*-Mutation." *HS*

118:48-74.

Schürr, Diether. 1997. "Lydisches IV: Zur Grammatik der Inschrift Nr. 22

(Sardes)." *Sprache* 39/2:201-212.

Schürr, Diether. 1999. "Lydisches I: Zur Doppelinschrift von Pergamon."

Kadmos 38:163-174.

Sehrt, Eduard. 1962. *Notker-Glossar*. Tübingen: Niemeyer.

Starke, Frank. 1990. *Studien zur Stammbildung des keilschrift-luwischen Nomens*

(*StBoT* 31). Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Yakubovich, Ilya. Forthcoming. *Sociolinguistics of the Luvian Language*

(University of Chicago dissertation). Chicago.